



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,436	08/30/2006	Young-Joo Oh	B1180/20057	5030
3060 7590		04/27/2010	EXAMINER	
CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN, COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD. 11TH FLOOR, SEVEN PENN CENTER 1635 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2212				LOFTREDO, JUSTIN E
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		3744
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/27/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@crbcp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,436	Applicant(s) OH ET AL.
	Examiner JUSTIN LOFFREDO	Art Unit 3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21,24-30,33,35-38 and 40 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21,24-30,33,35-38 and 40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 29, 2010 has been entered. Claims 21, 24-30, 33, 35-38 and 40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claim 35** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Consider claim 35, which recites "a cold gas outlet" (lines 1-2 of the claim). Claim 21, on which claim 35 depends, also recites "a cold gas outlet" (line 11 of the claim), and therefore it is unclear as to whether the cold gas outlet of claim 35 is the same as that of claim 21 or if it is an additional cold gas outlet. This renders the claim indefinite, but for the purposes of examination the examiner has interpreted this recitation in claim 35 to mean - -an additional cold gas outlet- -.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

5..... The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

6..... This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7..... **Claims 21, 33, 35 and 40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rode (US Patent No. 6,044,648) in view of Roslonski (US Patent No. 3,595,030) and Arner et al. (Arner) (US Patent No. 4,566,293).

Consider claim 21. Rode discloses cooling equipment (40) for cooling a cooled material, said cooling equipment comprising: a cooling space (50) capable of receiving the cooled material; inner walls (52) and (54) limiting the cooling space (50); a lid (46); an outer wall (see Figure 3 below); plenums (56), (58) and (60), which make up the claimed intermediate space

between the outer wall and the inner walls (52) and (54); and a perforated tube (66) (corresponding to the claimed cooling agent supply line) communicating with and emptying into the intermediate space for introducing a cooling agent, whereby most of the liquid cooling agent (i.e. not all of the liquid cooling agent is necessarily vaporized, and thus, some of the liquid cooling agent is introduced in the intermediate space (see col. 1, L 59-col.2, L 7)), wherein the cooling agent supply line (66) empties into the intermediate space between the inner walls (52) and (54) and the outer wall, and continuously transfers the cooling agent into the cooling space (col. 3, L 10-48; Fig. 3).

Rode fails to disclose a porous buffer material arranged in the intermediate space; the cooling agent supply line introducing the cooling agent into the porous buffer material; the cooling agent being transferred from the buffer material through the inner wall with the inner wall being permeable; and the ability of the cooling equipment to function without a cooling agent lake forming on a bottom of the cooling space. Roslonski teaches a porous buffer material (34) arranged in an outer compartment (32) (corresponding to the claimed intermediate space), and an inner wall (20) having holes (36) (corresponding to the claim that the inner wall is permeable) (col. 2, L 24-71; Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cooling equipment disclosed by Rode to also incorporate the porous buffer material arranged in the intermediate space and the inner wall being permeable as taught by Roslonski so that the cooling agent supply line introduces the cooling agent into the porous buffer material to then transfer the cooling agent from the buffer material through the inner wall, in order to effectively insulate and maintain a reduced temperature in the cooling space while distributing the cooling agent to pass through the

permeable inner wall into the cooling space. Furthermore, the presence of the porous buffer material would capture liquid refrigerant flowing through the intermediate space not vaporized in the cooling agent supply line, thereby preventing the formation of a cooling agent lake at the bottom of the cooling space. Additionally, while it does appear that a cooling agent lake could form within plenum (60) around the coil (68), claim 21 recites that “no cooling agent lake forms on a bottom of *the cooling space*” (lines 13-14). The opening provided at the bottom of the cooling space (50) of the apparatus disclosed by Rode would prevent the formation of a cooling agent lake at the bottom of the cooling space as recited in the claim (see Rode, annotated Fig. 3).

Rode also fails to disclose a removable protective bell on the cooling space, the bell including an interior chamber communicating with the cooling space at least partially transparent, glove sleeves on a front side thereof, and a cold gas outlet located on a lower side of the bell communicating with the cooling space through the interior chamber allowing cooling agent and cold gas to exit the cooling space through the protective bell. Arner teaches a removable protective bell (10) on the cooling space, where the bell (10) includes an interior chamber (Fig. 1) communicating with the cooling space at least partially transparent (col. 3, L 5-8), glove sleeves (21) on a front side thereof, and a cold gas outlet (25) located on a lower side of the bell (10) communicating with the cooling space through the interior chamber capable of allowing cooling agent and cold gas to exit the cooling space through the protective bell (see e.g. col. 3, L 5-58; Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the removable cover (46) and modify the cooling equipment disclosed by Rode to include a removable, protective, partially transparent bell with an interior chamber, glove sleeves, and a cold gas outlet as taught by Arner so that the bell is on the cooling space, the

interior chamber communicating with the cooling space so that the cold gas outlet communicates with the cooling space also to allow cooling agent and cold gas to exit the cooling space in order to protect temperature sensitive items to be cooled within the cooling space, and to allow for the gas that has already exchanged heat with the items to be released so that fresh cooling gas can be introduced into the cooling space, thereby promoting a more efficient cooling operation rather than ineffectively recirculating warmer gas. The transparent bell and glove sleeves together allow the items within the cooling space to more accurately be arranged or prepared in situ without permitting gas exchange while allowing a user to monitor the items through the transparent portion of the bell. For the forgoing reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the cooling equipment disclosed by Rode to incorporate the protective bell arrangement as taught by Arner to be arranged as claimed by the applicant here.

Consider claim 33. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed, and Arner discloses that the protective bell (10) has a sample holder (28) (corresponding to the claimed sample lock) (see e.g. col. 3, L 60-65; Figs. 4, 5).

Consider claim 35. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed, and Rode specifically discloses a pressure relief valve (80) and aperture (82) (corresponding to the claimed another cold gas outlet) via which cooling agent and cold gas can escape from the cooling space (50) being arranged on an upper side of the cooling space (50) (Col. 3, L 5-7 & 36-40; Figure 3).

Consider claim 40. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed, and Rode specifically discloses a cooling agent such as liquid nitrogen (Col. 3, L 2-3).

8. **Claims 24, 29 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rode, Roslonski and Arner as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Binder (US Patent No. 5,601,143).

Consider claim 24. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed but fails to disclose the inner wall being substantially grid shaped. Binder teaches inner walls (18) of a limiting a space (10), the inner walls (18) having a plurality of apertures (38) (corresponding to the inner wall being substantially grid shaped). The apertures are clearly positioned on a network of substantially uniformly spaced horizontal and perpendicular lines (see Figure 4), which renders the wall substantially grid shaped (col. 3, L55-60; Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the inner wall of the cooling device disclosed by Rode as modified to be substantially grid shaped as taught by Binder in order to produce a connection between the cooling space and the inner wall that allows refrigerant to flow into the cooling space in a uniform manner.

Consider claims 29 and 30. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed but fails to disclose a heating element being arranged in the cooling space; or that the heating element is arranged under a heating plate, the heating plate having several perforations that make a circulation of gas possible. Binder teaches a heating element (44) being arranged in a cooling space; the heating element (44) being arranged under the base (12) and behind side walls (18), which make up a heating plate, the heating plate having several apertures (38) (i.e. perforations) that make a circulation of gas possible (col. 3, L 30-60; col. 4, L 11-14, 49-56; Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

cooling device disclosed by Rode as modified to include the heat element arrangement taught by Binder in order to control the temperature of the circulating air in the cooling space.

9..... **Claims 25 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rode, Roslonski and Arner as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Barthel (US Patent No. 4,481,779).

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Consider claims 25 and 26. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed but fails to disclose the inner wall being made of a thermally conductive material, which further consists essentially of metal. Barthel teaches that the inner wall (28) of a cooling container can be made of any material composition, e.g. metal or plastic (col. 5, L 26-27), metal being a thermally conductive material. It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cooling device disclosed by Rode as modified to include a thermally conductive inner wall taught by Barthel in order to provide a thermally conductive material effective for cooling, whereby metal is a material that will retain its form after being repeatedly subjected to cold shocks at liquid nitrogen temperatures.

10..... **Claims 27 and 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rode, Roslonski and Arner as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Palma (US Patent No. 3,618,336).

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Consider claims 27 and 28. Rode as modified discloses the claimed invention, but fails to disclose the cooling space being vat shaped where the cooling agent supply line has a cooling agent distributor along the upper circumferential edge to introduce a cooling agent into the intermediate space in a distributed manner over the length of the cooling agent distributor. Palma teaches a cooled coffin structure where the wall of the coffin is hollow and passages are provided

which are cooling agent distributors communicating with the interior of the hollow wall and the interior of the coffin, which is the cooling space, and means such as a blower or fan are provided outside of the coffin to continuously circulate air which is a cooling agent through the hollow walls so that a stream of cooling agent flows into the intermediate space and then into the cooling (col. 1, L 46-55; col. 2, L 13-15). A channel (20) that is a cooling agent supply line extends circumferentially along the internal sides of the wall portion (14) (col. 1, L 46-55; Col. 2, L 13-15). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cooling device disclosed by Rode as modified to incorporate the cooling distribution arrangement taught by Palma in order to more uniformly distribute the cooling agent throughout the entire cooling space.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

11. **Claim 36 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rode, Roslonski and Arner as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Weng (US Patent No. 6,845,628).

Consider claim 36. Rode as modified discloses the claimed invention, but fails to disclose a temperature sensor in the cooling space capable of measuring a temperature in the cooling space; a controllable cooling agent valve capable of adjusting an amount of cooling agent supplied; or a temperature control device capable of regulating the temperature in the cooling space, the temperature control device being connected on an input to the temperature sensor and on an output side to the cooling agent valve. Weng teaches a temperature control device with a temperature sensor that senses temperature at a specified location within a refrigeration apparatus. The temperature control device has a first flow valve (corresponding to the claimed cooling agent valve) that can selectively increase or decrease the flow of refrigerant in response

to temperature sensed by the sensor. The temperature sensor also contains a controller (corresponding to the claimed temperature control device) that is capable of controlling the valve in response to temperature sensed (col. 2, L 2-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cooling device with a cooling space disclosed by Rode as modified to incorporate the temperature controlling arrangement and temperature sensor as taught by Weng in order to monitor and provide reliable control for the temperature within the cooling space of the device by providing the sensor within the cooling space so that the temperature is appropriate for cooling products.

Consider claim 38. Rode as modified discloses the invention as claimed, and Weng specifically discloses that the temperature sensor senses temperature at a specified location within the refrigeration apparatus (i.e. in the cooling space as discussed in the rejection of claim 36) capable of measuring a temperature of a cryosample in the cooling space (col. 2, L 2-14).

12..... **Claim 37** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rode, Roslonski, Arner and Weng as applied to claim 36, and further in view of Ali (US Patent No. 5,546,756).

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Consider claim 37. Rode as modified discloses the claimed invention, but fails to disclose the temperature control device connected via a pulse generator to the cooling agent valve, where the pulse generator is capable of alternatively opens and closes the cooling agent valve. Ali discloses a controller (1) (corresponding to the claimed temperature control device) including, i.e. connected via, a pulse generator to valve (6) (corresponding to the claimed cooling agent valve), where the pulse generator is capable of alternatively opening and closing the cooling agent valve (6) via a pulse width control signal (col. 2, L 61-61; col. 3, L 4-10, 37-40; Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

the cooling device disclosed by Rode as modified to include the controller and valve arrangement taught by Ali in order to control cooling within the cooling space by controlling the amount of cooling agent that flows through the valve and into the cooling space.

Rode – Figure 3





FIG. 3



Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed January 29, 2010 with respect to the combination of Rode and Roslonski to disclose the claimed protective bell and cold gas outlet have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the amendment to the claims.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

14. Applicant's addition arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's argument (Remarks p. 8) that the combination Rode and Roslonski fail to disclose that the cooling agent is transferred from the buffer material into the cooling space, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Referring to the rejection of claim 21, the examiner indicated that Rode as modified by Roslonski discloses this limitation. Rode discloses the cooling equipment having at least an inner wall and a cooling space, and Roslonski disclosed a buffer material (34) arranged in an outer compartment around a cooling space (see the rejection of claim 21). Therefore, when the apparatus of Rode is modified to include the buffer material of Roslonski in the intermediate space, the cooling agent does in fact pass through the buffer material prior to passing through the inner wall and into the cooling space (see Rode, Fig. 3). This is considered an attack on the Rode reference individually, and it has been held that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to the applicant's argument (Remarks p. 9) that the reliance on the Palma reference is improper because it is for a coffin and therefore totally unrelated, the examiner disagrees. Under this analysis, the cooling agent distributor taught by Palma solves the problem identified by the applicant (see applicant's disclosure, p. 4) of uniformly introducing cooling agent into the space to promote uniform temperature distribution since Palma discloses providing the hollow cooling agent distributor passages to circulate air over and around the entire interior

space for more effective cooling (see e.g. col. 1, L 40-60), which provides a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUSTIN LOFFREDO whose telephone number is (571) 270-7114. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler and Frantz Jules can be reached on (571) 272-4834 and (571) 272-6681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cheryl J. Tyler/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3744

/JL/
April 13, 2010